


the Office Action then stated that the inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. The action asserted that the apparatus can be used to practice another process, for example, the means for detecting a plastic sheet extending outwardly from the discharge end of the conveyer can be used in a process for packaging products instead of trim pressing.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claims are directed to apparatus which is specifically adapted for feeding plastic sheet material to a trim press, and that the apparatus is constructed to carry out the methods as set forth in method Claims 32-39. Thus, the apparatus claims are closely related to the method claims, with the method claims defining the method carried out by the apparatus, so that all of the claims are directed to the same invention. Because of the overlapping and coextensive subject matter of the apparatus claims and the method claims, a search directed to one of the sets of claims must necessarily overlap with and be coextensive with a search directed to the other set of claims.

Thus, it is submitted that all of the claims in the application should appropriately be maintained together and be examined together in this application, and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is thus respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Harry C. Engstrom", is written over a horizontal line.

Harry C. Engstrom, Reg. No. 26,876  
Attorney for Applicant  
Foley & Lardner  
150 East Gilman Street  
Post Office Box 1497  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1497  
(608) 258-4207